

Application No.: 09/885032

Case No.: 56827US002

Taikai discloses a liquid crystal display device that includes a removable front polarizer, allowing a user to remove and place the front polarizer directly in front of the user's eyes so that only the user can view the displayed information. Taikai does not teach or suggest replacing the front polarizer with a second front polarizer that can be attached to the device and that provides for a different display appearance.

Maatta discloses a mobile phone that has a replaceable cover, including a replaceable front window through which a display is viewable. Maatta discloses that the original and replacement covers and windows can have distinctive colors.

In order to state a prima facie case of obviousness using a combination of references, it must be shown that the combination teaches all of the claimed elements, that a motivation exists to make the proposed combination, and that one of skill in the art would reasonably expect success when making the proposed combination. In this case, neither Taikai nor Maatta discloses providing and attaching a second front polarizer to a liquid crystal display from which a first front polarizer has been removed and where the second front polarizer provides a different display appearance than the first, for example by inverting characters and background or by changing the colors of one or both of the characters and the background. As such, the combination does not disclose all the elements recited in Applicants' claims, assuming such a combination was proper in the first place.

Even so, there is no motivation to make the proposed combination. In the Taikai document, the stated purpose for removing the front polarizer is to provide privacy. Changing display appearance is not contemplated or appreciated. The Maatta document is concerned entirely with changing appearances of a mobile phone, primarily by replacing its cover plate, but also by putting a colored window over its display. Because Maatta already provides a solution to changing display appearance and makes no mention of the desirability, much less the ability, of changing display appearance through replaceable front polarizers, one of skill in the art would not be motivated to make the proposed combination.

For these reasons, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection of claims 1-8 over Taikai in view of Maatta.

Claims 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taikai in view of Maatta and in further view of GB 2307562 (Ching). Applicants disagree.

Application No.: 09/885032

Case No.: 56827US002

Ching discloses a liquid crystal display device in which the colors are generated through the application of different electric fields causing different changes in cell retardation as opposed to relying on color filters. Ching adds nothing to cure the deficiencies noted above for the proposed combination of Taikai and Maatta. Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection of claims 9 and 10 over Taikai in view of Maatta and in further view of Ching.

Applicants submit that claims 1-10 are in condition for allowance and request early indication of the same.

Respectfully submitted,

May 31, 2005

Date

By: 

Robert J. Pechman, Reg. No.: 45,002

Telephone No.: (651) 737-0631

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel
3M Innovative Properties Company
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833